QA 515
.C62
Copy 1

D 515
.C62
Copy 1

A REPLY

TO

Mr. Samuel Harden Church's Pamphlet

ON

"The American Verdict on the War"

BY

ERNEST LUDWIG

Austro-Hungarian Consul in Cleveland

Author of "Austria-Hungary and the War", and other books

PRICE, 10 CENTS

CLEVELAND, Ohio, April 23, 1915.

MR. SAMUEL HARDEN CHURCH,
President of the Carnegie Institute,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

DEAR SIR:—

My attention was drawn to your pamphlet which is named "The American Verdict on the War." I presume that the title was applied by your publishers, as it does not appear from your letter to Dr. Schaper, that the American people or Government had entrusted you to pass a verdict on the war for either of the two—nor does it appear that its contents were ratified by anybody except yourself and possibly your publishers. Nevertheless, even as an individual statement, it is a remarkable statement and calls forth a reply from such as are directly or indirectly involved in several of your assertions.

You say in your letter: *"We are all going deeper than the surface in our search for the truth."* Permit me to point out here a few assertions in your letter which, as far as your person is involved, certainly do not bear out the preceding statement.

I. "Well, we all know that Austria, away back in 1908 made seizure of the two provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina. A thing like that enrages the human spirit, and the brains of some men will not act normally under such extreme provocation." This assertion is based on *surface* knowledge *only*. Article XXV. of the Berlin Convention, 1878, expressly stipulated that "Austria-Hungary will occupy and rule the provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina." In handing over these provinces to Austria-Hungary the suzerainty rights of the Sultan over them were—it is true—recognized, but only to a very limited extent. The mandate which we received in 1878 to occupy the two provinces was unlimited as to terms and subject to no conditions whatsoever. On December 24th, 1879, a close tariff and trade union was established between the two provinces and the dual monarchy. In all matters of trade, customs, Austria-Hungary was to represent Bosnia and Herzegovina abroad. Our currency, on tobacco, salt and gunpowder monopolies were extended over the territory of the two provinces. The same is true concerning the indirect taxation of beer, alcohol, sugar and other articles, later on of the direct taxation. Austria-Hungary had the exclusive right of mint in the two provinces, which, from olden time, has always stood as the right of the ruler. Bosnia and Herzegovina adopted our measures and weights. Our postal and telegraph service was also extended over Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1879. On November 13, 1881, a law was enacted introducing

D. OF A.
SEP 2 1915

military service in Bosnia and Herzegovina for the benefit of Austria-Hungary.

What remained really to indicate the sovereign rights of the Ottoman Porte? Two prerogatives, to wit: that on official Turkish holidays the Green Flag of the Prophet was hoisted, together with ours, on public buildings, and that the name of the Sultan was included in the public prayers.

During the thirty years of her peaceful possessions and quasi-ownership, Austria-Hungary invested hundreds of millions of dollars in building churches, schools, railroads, roads, etc., etc., and has transformed the two provinces into practically the most flourishing countries in the Balkans, although they were ruined and desolate in every respect, when she assumed charge of them in 1878.

The formal annexation in 1908 ended the Sultan's nominal sovereignty and put a term to an anomalous situation which had lasted thirty years, Austria-Hungary bearing all the responsibilities but not the formal title of the owner. Why was the annexation proclaimed and why did we not continue the former way of rule? Because, in 1908, the Young Turks initiated a parliamentary regime in Turkey and it would have created a very awkward situation and no end of conflicts had Turkey, for instance, called upon the Moslems in Bosnia and Herzegovina to send delegates to the Parliament in Constantinople. The annexation of these provinces was a perfectly harmless affair. No blood was shed, no harm was done to anybody of the population which, far from objecting to it, sent delegations to Vienna asking for a full incorporation into the Dual Monarchy. Russia knew of it beforehand and gave her consent on condition that we did not object to the opening of the Straits of Constantinople to her battleships, etc. This was decided at a conference of the respective representatives in the Castle of Buchlau, Moravia. It is true this latter privilege was later objected to by both France and England, but Russia's subsequent antagonism against Austria-Hungary on this account, which finally led to the formation of the Balkan league, was unjustified. As to Turkey, which was the chiefly interested party, we made a regular bargain with her, paying her an indemnity of fifty-four million crowns* for the abandonment by the Sultan of a nudum jus sovereignty, just as you did in the case of the Philippines. We also gave up our rights to the Sandjak of Novi Bazar, which we had acquired through the Berlin Convention, in 1878. The signatory powers of the Congress of Berlin were formally notified and acquiesced. Servia, which had no claim whatsoever to Bosnia and Herzegovina, was the only power which remonstrated, but was finally, in 1909, admonished by

*That is, we paid the Sultan one-eighth million crowns for the prayers said on his behalf each year for thirty years during which the occupation had lasted. That is not such a bad record! Is it?

all the Great Powers of Europe to keep peace with the Dual Monarchy and to live with her henceforth as a good neighbor. She pledged her solemn word that *she would do so.* She has never kept her pledge. My book on "Austria-Hungary and War" discusses these alleged historical, ethnographical, etc., claims of Servia, over the two provinces so extensively that it is unnecessary for me to repeat them here.

You must admit, if you are unbiased, as you claim to be, that your statement is unfounded both in substance and in fact.

II. "In May, 1914, the Austrian Crown Prince went into these provinces. The people looked upon him as an *invader, a usurper, a conqueror, a tyrant, and he was assassinated.* It was a detestable act, condemned and abhorred by just men everywhere. I condemn it, detest it, and abhor it. But it was the penalty which any man would pay who would flagrantly invade a conquered province under like circumstances. There is always a hot-head ready to murder a tyrant, and a tyrant is one who makes himself a conqueror for his own aggrandizement. *In the eyes of those subjugated people, the Crown Prince was a tyrant.*"

These statements stand in flagrant contradiction to facts. The people of Bosnia and Herzegovina certainly did not look upon their Crown Prince as an invader. Read Chapter III. of "Austria-Hungary and the War," and particularly the final address of prosecuting attorney at the Sarajevo trial. Permit me to say that we know our own country better than foreigners do, and if you say that the people saw in the Crown Prince an invader, a usurper, a conqueror, a tyrant, you make so many assertions which have no foundations whatsoever. Can you really claim that you are going deeper than the thinnest surface in your search for the truth! You must gather your knowledge from the evidence of some fanatic Servians, who may have befriended you in order to gain your support, because the White Paper which you mention does not supply evidence for your statement. There were malcontents in Bosnia and Herzegovina —just as there are in your country and, in fact, everywhere, who do not sympathize with government or the administration, and in our case, they were in a strong minority. I refer to "Austria-Hungary and the War" and to the Austro-Hungarian Red Book to show how in Bosnia and Herzegovina these malcontents have been artificially fostered by Servian intrigues. Our evidence—I think—is ample and conclusive.

But to facilitate your task in finding some of this evidence I will point out here some passages contained in the Austro-Hungarian Red Book.

(a) In the report of Baron Giesl to Count Berchtold, under No. VI, you find this language: "Since the annexation crisis, the relations between the Dual Monarchy and Servia have been strained

by the jingoism and animosity of the latter and by an effective propaganda *for the "Great Servian" cause, carried on in those parts of our country which are inhabited by Serbs.* Servia's successes in the Balkan wars have *intensified that jingoism until it now manifests itself at times in outbreaks of frantic passion bordering upon madness."*

"I affirm it as an established axiom that Servia's policy has but *one aim, namely, the detachment from the Dual Monarchy of all territories inhabited by South-Slavs and the eventual destruction of that Monarchy as a great power.* Nobody who has spent a week in the discharge of his duties in this political atmosphere can question the truth of my assertion."

"I shall pass over the absurd accusations raised on the occasion of Hartwig's death, utterances verging on madness, which the London *Times* qualified as *"raging mad." Nor shall I dwell upon the mendacious press campaign which endeavors to confirm the Servian people in their conviction that the government of Austria-Hungary, as well as its representatives, are outlawed.* Terms like "murderers," "rascals," or "infamous Austrians," were some of the ornamental by-words applied to us.

"Hartwig's death, which meant a profound bereavement to the Servian political world, has been followed by a fanatic cult of the departed. This sentiment, however, was due not only to gratitude for his assistance in the past, but to a sense of apprehension as to the future. *Every effort was made to please Russia by a display of slave-like servility, in order to secure that country's good-will for the future."*

(b) Read No. VIII of the Red Book in its entirety. It contains Count Berchtold's instructions to the Imperial and Royal Ambassadors at Berlin, Rome, Paris, London, St. Petersburg, and Constantinople, concerning our note to Servia.

(c) Read the Memoir of the Red Book under XIX.

III. "Austria at once assumed to hold Servia responsible for this murder, and dispatched an ultimatum containing ten drastic conditions which were more exacting upon the dignity of Servia than any demand that was ever before made by one nation upon another. *Yet Servia yielded to all except* in parts as to Articles 5 and 6. In Article 5 the Imperial scheme of *Pan-Germanism was developed*—insidiously broached, it is true, but still it was put before Servia as a definite part of the plan of Austro-German expansion. Servia was required "to accept the collaboration in Servia of representatives of the Austro-Hungarian government in the suppression of the subversive movement directed against the territorial integrity of the (Austrian) monarchy."

Concerning these statements it can easily be seen that your

knowledge is gathered from the daily press more than from the perusal of the various diplomatic papers. If Austria-Hungary assumed at once to hold Servia responsible for this murder of the Crown Prince, she did so for good cause and based on evidence. Read No. IX of the Red Book (Count Berchtold to Count Mensdorf) and particularly this passage: "*Until today* (July 23, 1914; the murder occurred on June 28th) *the Servian government, in spite of much notorious circumstantial evidence pointing to Belgrade, has failed to do anything of that sort* (*id est*: *proceeding against the Servian accomplices of the murderers in Belgrade*), *but even has endeavored to efface the existing traces.*"

Our demands on Servia were commensurate to what she had done against us not only by inspiring and promoting the murder of the Crown Prince, because that was merely an individual instance of her hostility, but during all the past years, in fact ever since the ascension of King Peter to the blood-stained throne of Servia.

In No. X, being a report of Count Mensdorf to Count Berchtold, you can read that Sir Edward Grey was quite willing to regard the whole affair as concerning "solely Austria-Hungary and Servia." In No. XIII you can read that Mons. Bienvenu Martin, representing the French Foreign Office at that time, "was prepared to say at the outset that the French Government shares our opinion that our controversy with Servia concerned only Vienna and Belgrade."

Servia did not yield to our demands. Her acceptance of some of them in the form as they were accepted, was a sham acceptance. We know our Servian neighbor from our past experience and we knew that only the *unconditional acceptance of these terms would insure a cessation of her underground machinations against the safety and existence of the Monarchy.* See No. XXXIX of the Red Book (Count Berchtold to Count Mensdorf). "In view of the fact that the Servian Government was fully aware that the unconditional acceptance of our demands alone could satisfy us, the Servian tactics are easily fathomed. Servia has accepted, with various reservations, several of our demands in order to deceive public opinion in Europe, confident that she never would be called upon to carry out her promise. In your conversation with Sir Edward Grey, you will lay particular stress upon the circumstances that the general mobilization of the *Servian army was ordered for July the 25th, 3 o'clock P. M., while the reply to our note was handed in shortly before the expiration of the stipulated time, a few minute's before 6 o'clock.*" From this alone it can be seen, that Servia's answer was made in *bad faith.*

Your statement that in Article 5 the Imperial (!) scheme of Pan-Germanism (!) was developed sounds so utterly absurd, to anyone who even has a slight knowledge of conditions in Europe,

that one must wonder how you could assume to answer these ninety-three German professors, known all over the world as the representatives of thorough and conscientious research." Which Imperial scheme do you mean? Austria-Hungary's, Germany's? Clause 5 of our demands purported the establishment in Belgrade of a Governmental Information Bureau, such as Russia had in Paris and other governments mutually entertain in European capitals.

As to Article 6, Servia served the same demand on Hungary in 1868-70 in connection with the murder of Prince Obrenovic (pp. 64-65-66-67 of "Austria-Hungary and the War"). Hungary then thought this was the most natural demand to make under the circumstances and at once accepted it. Nobody even thought of considering this as an encroachment of Hungary's suzerainty. We, in 1868-70, had nothing to conceal to the world. Servia in 1914 had a lot to conceal. She was afraid of the truth of her guilt becoming common property.

IV. Equally absurd is your contention that "already Austria *had ravished Servia of two of her precious jewels* and was laying her plans now to despoil her of more." I presume that you think of Bosnia and Herzegovina, when you say her precious jewels." Servia has never owned either of the two, never has ruled over them—even for a day—as it is exhaustively shown in Chapter IV of "Austria-Hungary and the War," concerning Servia's claims over Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Czar Dusan, who evolved the idea of a Greater Servian Empire, has never ruled over Bosnia and Herzegovina. He had invaded these provinces twice and was both times defeated, once in 1353 by Stephan Kotromanovics (Stephan II) chief Zsupan of Bosnia, and the second time most decisively by King Louis the Great of Hungary. On the other hand, has Servia for many centuries been a vassal of the Kingdom of Hungary.

V. "It is well that we should keep in mind the avowed object of Germany and Austria in making this significant demand upon Servia, in order that we may be able to avoid the error of assuming that the Austrian war on Servia was merely a punitive expedition on account of the assassination of the Crown Prince of Austria. When these minatory conditions were published, Russia, as one of the great powers of Europe, naturally felt that she had a historical basis, and she did emphatically claim a right to a voice in determining whether the sovereignty of the kingdom of Servia should be permenently impaired. Germany well knew that an insistence upon this condition would make a general war inevitable; yet she proclaimed her insistence from the housetops, and defied Russia to interfere."

I have found *eight* particular instances in our Red Book in

which Austria-Hungary, through her authorized representatives, had emphatically declared to Russia, or the European Powers that our action *did not mean aggression, but self-defense and self-preservation, and that we did not contemplate conquest of Servian territory or destruction of Servian independence. We desire to obtain satisfaction for the past and guarantee for the future only.*" See in No. XVI, Count Szapáry to Count Berchtold; XVIII, Count Berchtold to Count Szapáry; XXVI, Count Berchtold to Count Szapáry; XXXII, Count Berchtold to Count Ezapáry; XXXVIII, Count Berchtold to Count Szögnény; XLVII, Count Szapáry to Count Berchtold; L, Count Berchtold to Count Szapáry, and LV, Count Szapáry to Count Berchtold.

Your statement that Russia naturally felt that she had such a historical right as you state, is a clear proof of your strong bias Your statement implies that Russia *had a* right to interfere with Austria-Hungary, but Austria-Hungary *none* to interfere with Servia and, furthermore, that Germany *should* have interfered with Austria-Hungary to avoid war, but that *it was not the duty* of France and England to see that Russia should *not* interfere with Austria-Hungary.

Russia, in taking up the cudgels for Servia in a local difference between the latter country and Austria-Hungary, treated Servia as her vassal. We naturally could not suffer that any state on our borders should voluntarily or involuntarily become a vassal of the Great Russian Empire as such a situation would have meant a constant menace to ourselves. Russia's attempts to forbid us to settle our differences with Servia were tantamount to curtailing our status as a Great Power, had we yielded. You seem to think that this was entirely right on the part of Russia, but that it was entirely wrong on our part to undertake anything whereby Servia's sovereignty might have been impaired—in your opinion. I do not say "Russia's opinion," because Russia fully knew what she had in mind. She did not bother about Servia's sovereignty. She merely sought a pretext for a war of conquest. She reckoned that time had come to destroy the Austro-Hungarian monarchy and enrich herself with the spoils. She was willing to pay some price to her Servian henchman and brother in crime.

If Germany proclaimed "her insistence" as you say, to fight if Russia intervened, she did so for perfectly *good* and *honest reasons*. She was bound by treaty to Austria-Hungary and knew that she would have to fight, if Russia intervened. In emphatically declaring that she would not shirk her duties as Austria-Hungary's partner, she thought that Russia and the rest of Russia's allies could be restrained. Had Sir Edward Grey honestly wanted to settle matters peacefully, he could have done it very simply by impressing upon Russia

and France to keep out of the local imbroglio between Servia and Austria-Hungary.

Today we know that England had engineered this world-war by bringing about the secret British-French entente, secret British-Russian entente, British-Japanese treaty and secret British-Belgian military understanding. Consequently Sir Edward Grey could not and did not honestly mean a peaceful settlement, when he suggested his plan of a conference.

VI. As regards your statement concerning Article 6, which you assert contained an *"unprecedented condition* that Austrian jurists should sit in the Servian Court"—this is again unfounded both in substance and fact. We merely asked *that "Austro-Hungarian officials should be admitted to co-operate in the preliminary police investigation which was to seek out and collect data for the judicial inquiry."* See the Enclosure to XXXIV, in the Austro-Hungarian Red Book.

VII. What you say about Servia's *candid* offer to hold further conversations on the subject or to refer the matter to The Hague Court or to the Great Powers of Europe, is again not borne out by facts. You assume that Servia was *candid* in all her doings, yet could she have easily avoided the whole imbroglio and the whole world-war by simply abstaining from some of the following activities: Systematic promotion of anti-Austro-Hungarian sentiment both in her own country and in *our* country; organization of open and secret societies to promote an anti-Austro-Hungarian propaganda, sending of murderers to our country who killed or tried to kill our Governors, Generals, Archdukes (I refer to the murderous attempts on the Banus of Crotia, Baron Skerlecz; the Crotian Commissioner, Dr. von Cuvay; Military Governor of Bosnia, Baron Varesanin, etc., etc.); the entire Greater Servian propaganda which with her other doings was in direct violation of her pledge given to the Great Powers in 1909 to live as a good neighbor with the Dual Monarchy.

The answer why our Servian differences could not have been submitted to The Hague Court you find in Chapter II of "Austria-Hungary and the War." We might ask you the same question: Why did your country not submit the "Maine question" to The Hague Court, before going to war against Spain? We had at least as good a reason to go to war against Servia as you had against Spain. Our country was peacefully inclined to the last and I refer you here to No. LI of the Red Book, showing that even as late as July 31st Count Berchtold issued instructions to our Ambassadors in St. Petersburg and London *"to thank the Secretary of State warmly for the communication made by Herr von Tschirschky and to express our readiness to consider Sir Edward Grey's proposition*

to mediate between us and Servia despite the changes brought about in the situation by Russia's mobilization."

In view of what you *dare* to assert, that "Germany has *not dared* to publish her correspondence with Austria and that Austria has not dared to publish her correspondence with Germany," this statement of our *State Secretary directly referring to the German Representative's activities in behalf of peace as late as July 31st,* must come to you as an evidently unwelcome revelation, as it throws overboard all your unneutral and biased theories concerning the world-war. You realize, of course, that each government in these diplomatic papers publishes the correspondence of the Foreign office and the *national* Ambassadors *only,* the German White Book containing in addition a direct correspondence between Emperor William, the Czar of Russia, the King of England, and Prince Henry of Prussia.

It is Russia which has assiduously refused to make a peaceful settlement possible. In the first interview of our Ambassador and Mr. Sazanow (reported in No. XIV of the Red Book on July 24) you find this attitude clearly illustrated. Count Szapáry says at the end: "In spite of the *comparative* calmness of the Minister's manner, *his attitude was throughout one of negation and antagonism."* This same attitude you will find illustrated in most of the subsequent interviews as reported in the correspondence of our Red Book. They strongly evidence the desire of Russian Government to gain time only. Thus, for instance, you find this tendency expressed in XXI and XL of the Red Book.

Our position with reference to peaceful settlement you find best expressed in Count Berchtold's telegram to Count Mensdorff, July 28 (reported in XLI) wherein it is stated: *"Inasmuch as Sir Edward Grey is desirous to serve the cause of European peace, he certainly will meet with no opposition from us. But he should realize that the peace of Europe would not be preserved, if Great Powers stood behind Servia and assured her impunity. Suppose, even, that we agreed to attempt such a compromise, Servia as a result would only be encouraged to persevere in her old tactics—a situation which would once more endanger peace in a very short time."*

VIII. In a later connection you say this: "Returning to the German White Book we read that after Austria had attacked Servia, Russia began to mobilize her army." Here you find yourself again at variance with facts. Servia issued her mobilization order three hours before delivering her answer to our note on July 26th. Servian troops began to attack the Hungarian frontier before we had declared war. See No. XI. Our mobilization against Servia was proclaimed July 29th. Our general mobilization on August 1st. If you will carefully reread the Czar of Russia's tele-

gram to His Majesty Kaiser Wilhelm II, of July 30th, you will find therein the following message: "I thank you from my heart for your quick reply. I am sending tonight Tatisheff (Russian honorary aide to the Kaiser) with instructions. The military measures now taking form were decided upon *five days ago.*" This telegram is included in the German White Paper. It is clear, therefore, that according to this official Russian admission—for who was better qualified to make such an admission than the Czar himself—Russia began her military mobilization measures on *July 25th.* We know of course, today, from other evidence, that Russia began the mobilization of her Siberian army corps shortly after the murder of our Crown Prince.

IX. This is what you say further down: "For Austria is only a ramshackle empire, bound together by a rope of sand, not able to assimilate various races into one homogeneous nation." This statement betrays two things on your part: your total ignorance of matters concerning the Dual Monarchy and the origin of your source from where you slavishly quote, to wit: Lloyd George's speech on "Austria's ramshackle empire," which was published in the daily press. Assuming that this speech was really made, I would like to draw your attention to the rather remarkable fact that this "ramshackle empire" still gives a good account of itself both in a military way and economically, that is financially. In fact, a much better account in both ways than England! We had to hold off the immense armies of Russian millions and we have held them off, relying on our own strength alone. Can the British say as much for themselves, who have bought hirelings from all over the world to do the fighting for them while their sons play cricket and football at home! Do you call a country a "ramshackle empire" which raised three and one-half billion crowns in a week among its own people, as we did in November last, and raised within the very first days of the war nearly a million volunteers—that is men who, under the law, were not liable to any kind of military service; whereas it took the famous Kitchener army of a million volunteers eight months—*not yet to materialize.* That is undoubtedly also a record. Although Austria-Hungary today is surrounded by a myriad of enemies enlisted for England's selfish purposes, we have the strongest possible confidence that she and Germany will come out as the ultimate victors. *The rope of sand which you mention is really a golden bond of fealty which has held together our glorious monarchy for far more centuries than the United States is in existence.* The history of the common past and common traditions have welded all our various nationalities together in a much firmer union than England and Ireland, much firmer than both you, Mr. Lloyd George and our uniformed ill-wishers would apparently like to have it. Austria-Hungary's historical mission in the past has been one of preserving

the peculiarities, the culture, the language of each of her motley nationalities. The Dual Monarchy, I might say, embodies the principle of how various races can be kept together in a political union without interfering with their racial differences. "This principle of political assimilation"—as our distinguished countryman, Count Albert Apponyi, expressed himself some time ago—"reminds one of the Romans, who gave the right of Roman citizenship to the provincials and through that procedure succeeded in creating a strong Roman spirit in the Gauls in Spain and so on." Austria-Hungary's political structure affords these various nationalities a heightened degree of protection from foreign enemies. It also supplies them with greater possibilities for economic advance, and for the conclusion of more favorable treaties of commerce, etc. It benefits them, in short, with all the attributes of a great Power. Thus the people of a possibly lower type of culture by being politically affiliated with those representing a higher type of civilization, enjoy a greater degree of safety than if they would be organized in a "mass of small racial principalities" unable to resist the devouring appetites of the greater neighbors.

It is not at all true that we have stifled the individual aspirations of our various nationalities, as our enemies, sometimes charge. What is true is that we have not encouraged movements which endangered the safety and existence of the monarchy. That was natural and, I am quite sure, you would not encourage them either if they would endanger the safety and existence of your country.

Let me draw your attention in this connection to Russia—which since the beginning of the war, part of your magazine writers and others, yourself included—welcome as a champion of the smaller races and weaker nations. Russia in ruthlessly applying her Pan-Russian theories to life, has simply tried to bring down everything to the Russian level. Her whole history shows it and I defy any adverse critics to prove their contrary assertions that she has not oppressed the Finns in Finland, the Germans in her provinces in Kurland, Esthland, Livland, the Poles in Poland, and above all, the Ruthenians in Ukrainia. Is it not true that she has stamped out the language of these latter, a people of thirty to thirty-five millions, proclaiming that it was no language at all, but merely a bastard-dialect of Russian? With all her might she has tried to wipe out the Polish element and I think you, with a few million of splendid Polish-Americans in your midst should, more than others, appreciate the magnitude of Russia's crime in the latter's attempts to wipe out a higher type of civilization than her own, Anybody who admires freedom, justice and the rights of smaller nations, after the proclaimed pattern of Sir Edward Grey, must certainly acknowledge that Austria-Hungary has not, either forcibly or other-

wise, Germanized her various nationalities, which, Russia in her place, would certainly have done.

Austria-Hungary's mission in the past has been that of being a bulwark of western Europe and Occidental Christianity against the brutal, material invasion from the Orient, and against all Oriental influences endangering what we call Occidental civilization.

If at times dissatisfaction has been voiced by isolated fractions of our nationalities, this was local only and due to our adoption of too lenient methods. We also, in a few instances, may have earned ingratitude where recognition was merited. But do not overrate these instances and do not underrate the cohesive strength of the Monarchy. Remember that even H. Adams Gibbons, who is a champion of the Allies' cause, says in his "New Map of Europe," "The Austro-Hungarian Empire has been founded upon sound political and economic principles which far transcend a single life or a dynasty."

X. In regard to the alleged German atrocities in Belgium permit me to draw your attention to the fact that our country declared war on Belgium for the atrocities of Belgian civilians against Austro-Hungarian non-combatants. This is what the declaration of war contained in No. LXVII of the Austro-Hungarian Red Book says: "In view of the recently established fact that Austrian and Hungarian subjects resident in Belgium have, under the eyes of the Royal authorities, been treated in a manner contrary to the most primitive laws of humanity, and inadmissible toward subjects of a hostile State, Austria-Hungary is necessarily compelled to break off diplomatic relations and considers herself from now on in a state of war with Belgium."

The balance of your remarks concerns Germany more directly than Austria-Hungary and I leave it, therefore, to others better qualified than I to answer you.

From the above excerpts one would, however, have to come to the conclusion, that in launching your pamphlet, you were not sufficiently prepared to meet the issues; in other words, you are making your conclusions in a superficial way, based on surface knowledge. I am no German, but as far as I know Germans, I know that there is nothing which they more deprecate than assumed judgment based on surface knowledge. Your statements concerning the German issues contain, I am afraid, nothing but a bundle of errors, and I could well understand if these conscientious German professors would leave your pamphlet without reply.

I do not know for what you stand in this war. From various statements of your pamphlet I gained the impression that you must have fallen a comparatively easy prey to the will-o'-the-wisp and fancy stories of some reporters. So it came that you can believe that unhappy, ignorant Servia could be the champion of individual

freedom and civilization and you can believe that Austria-Hungary robbed her of her two precious jewels, usurping *her visionary rights* over Bosnia and Herzegovina. Great as our admiration is for American achievements on the field of practical sciences, we have at times had occasion to be surprised at the somewhat superficial knowledge of European history on the part of seemingly well informed authors. Now, during these terrible months of war, more than ever! This may be why some of your representative Americans have not been able to grasp this European war-situation. This is also why you seem constantly to ignore Hungary in speaking of the Monarchy as Austria, although you should know that the Monarchy is dual, consisting of two independent States!

Of course, we know that Americans pride themselves on their belief in individual freedom. They say that England and her allies are the champions of this individual freedom, whereas in Austria-Hungary and Germany, individual freedom—so they think—is suppressed. What a curious mistake this is! Germany and Austria-Hungary—it is true—do not believe in individual utilitarianism. We do not believe that individual pleasure and individual happiness are all that human beings should exclusively strive for. We believe in organized, efficient work of all individuals for the common welfare of all. We believe in subordinating your craving for individual success and pleasure to the general efforts of all to improve our higher ideals of culture. England is the land of conventionalism. That is why Bernard Shaw will never be appreciated in England. To call England the champion of individual freedom, when each individual in England has to subordinate himself to the conventional ideas of his party or his set, seems at least out of place. The question is whether your country has to an appreciable extent adopted this English conventional freedom of the individual or not. I cannot believe it. I wish that you have not and should not.

There is another thing that I may be permitted to say. That the Carnegie Peace Institute could not prevent the war is deplorable, but excusable. The greatness of the task surpassed its strength. Although it extended its activities all over the civilized earth, the work undertaken was still in its infancy. But more deplorable, both from our and from the American point of view, seems to be that your Institute cannot stop the huge exportation of man-killing weapons to the European battlefields. Through the courtesy of your Institute I receive your periodical publications. From time to time I have read about the denunciation by some of your representative members, of Krupp and Creuzot, Skoda or Armstrong, etc., that the driving out of business of one or both or all of these firms would be a great step towards peace, etc. And what is the situation today? There is probably not one firm in the world that manufactures more man-killing weapons for the armies in the field than

the Bethlehem Steel Co. and its affiliates. We are fully aware of the legal status of this question about the shipment of guns and ammunition. We know it is not technically unneutral to do so. It is the fact that your own country is the largest supplier of this war-material, that hundreds of thousands of our own immigrants are practically forced to earn their daily bread in this wholesale slaughter-manufacture, that they have to supply their hands' labor in the manufacturing of these weapons intended for the killing of their own brothers and cousins across the sea, and last but not least, that your Carnegie Institute has done nothing towards the inhibition of this unholy business, is, in fact, acquiescing in it, as if it would have no concern whatsoever in it—these are the things which make one ponder and lose faith in the sincerity of your Institute's peace propaganda!

These are a few ideas which occurred to me in reading your pamphlet.

I do not wish you to believe that I mean offense in writing you. Nothing is farther from my mind. I assure you there is nothing personal in my remarks to you, although I naturally must resent some of your unjustified remarks and slurs cast upon my country and that of our allies. I am addressing you this letter merely as a matter of duty to my countrymen and to myself. A neglect to refute attacks of this kind made in public, gives sometimes rise to misinpretation.

Very truly yours,

ERNEST LUDWIG,
Consul for Austria-Hungary.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 015 900 862 9

Published and distributed
by the
German-American Literary Defense Committee,
150 Nassau Street, New York.

Holl

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 015 900 862 9